UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,330	10/780,330 02/17/2004 Gilbert Wolrich		10559-127002/P7866C	1102
59796 INTEL CORPC	7590 03/09/201 <b>DRATION</b>	EXAMINER		
c/o CPA Global		THAMMAVONG, PRASITH		
P.O. BOX 5205 MINNEAPOLI	=	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2187	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/09/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/780,330	WOLRICH ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
PRASITH THAMMAVONG	2187	

	PRASITH THAMMAVONG	2187	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 16 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Armo event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (left)</li> </ul>	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropriat nally set in the final Offic	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi <u>AMENDMENTS</u></li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	isideration and/or search (see NOTw);	ΓE below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12			PTOL-324).
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>	·		·
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 36-43. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>	, , , , , ,	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/P. T./ Examiner, Art Unit 2187	/Brian R. Peugh/ Primary Examiner, Art U March 4, 2010	nit 2187	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The Examiner acknowledges the applicant's submission of the amendment dated 2/16/10, which has been entered. At this point claims 28-35 and 44-45 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 36-43 are pending in the instant application.

In response to the argument that the Tremblay reference does not teach "mapping addresses in a single address space to resources within a set of multiple programmable units" where the single address space includes "addresses for different ones of the resources in different ones of the multiple programmable units", the Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Examiner contends that the Tremblay reference teaches the limitation above as it teaches the use of multiple registers within multiple processors (see fig. 3, registers 306 and 312; and processors p1 208 and 210) accessing locations within a shared instruction cache (see fig. 3, instruction cache 212) which allows access to the main memory 202, as seen in fig. 3, column 4, lines 7-29 and 30-58.

Also in response to the argument that the Tremblay reference does not teach a single address space, the Examiner contends that the Tremblay reference teaches the use of a single address space as the registers within the processors are accessing locations in the instruction cache 212 which allows access to the main memory 202, as noted in the citations above.

Thus, the Examiner contends that the Tremblay references teaches the limitations above as broadly and instantly claimed, and that the combination of the Tremblay and Sharma references teaches the limitations of claim 36 as broadly and instantly claimed.

.